



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,416	07/23/2004	Daniel Greub	0115-044591	3939
28389 7590 04/29/2008 THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219				
EXAMINER				
CHIEH, DINH D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2883				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/502,416

Applicant(s)

GREUB, DANIEL

Examiner

ERIN D. CHIEM

Art Unit

2883

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-26 and 38-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-26 and 38-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to applicant's arguments filed on January 9, 2008. Currently, claims 17-26, 28-36, and 38-44 are pending and of which, claims 18-26 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. (US 6,666,586) in view of Zimmer (US 2002/0150350 A1).

Regarding claims 17 and 36, Wu discloses in Fig. 5, A sleeve mount assembly (100) comprising a sleeve mount having an interior for accommodating and securing a cylindrical sleeve (20) having a longitudinal slit, the sleeve mount assembly further comprising optical plug-in connections (12, 50) for accommodating ferrules of two optical plug-in connectors introduced from opposite directions, the sleeve mount having means for securing the sleeve against rotation about a sleeve axis (70, 71, 72, 151) wherein the means for securing are arranged in a central part of the sleeve mount, the sleeve mount is made up of two separate mount parts (111 and 60), and the means for securing are arranged and retained between the mount parts (the assembly parts are between element 111 and 60).

However, Wu does not disclose the means for securing the split sleeve against rotation.

Zimmel disclose a fiber optic adapter wherein the means (173) for preventing the split sleeve (152) from rotation protrudes into the slit and is between the mount parts (Fig. 12). It would have been obvious to recognize the motivation of Wu and Zimmel implementation is to prevent rotation in the members. Therefore in view of the disclosure by Zimmel, one of ordinary skill in the art would modify the adapter in view of the teaching by Zimmel. The teaching of Zimmel is an improvement over Wu since Zimmel utilizes less mountable parts and maintain minimal play in the adapter by engaging the split sleeve rather than a partially split sleeve element of the adapter.

Claims 17, 28-32, 34-36, 38-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. (US 6,666,586) in view of Kakii et al. (JP 01031104 A).

Wu discloses in Fig. 5, A sleeve mount assembly (100) comprising a sleeve mount having an interior for accommodating and securing a cylindrical sleeve (20) having a longitudinal slit, the sleeve mount assembly further comprising optical plug-in connections (12, 50) for accommodating ferrules of two optical plug-in connectors introduced from opposite directions, the sleeve mount having means for securing the sleeve against rotation about a sleeve axis (70, 71, 72, 151) wherein the means for securing are arranged in a central part of the sleeve mount, the sleeve mount is made up of two separate mount parts (111 and 60), and the means for securing are arranged and retained between the mount parts (the assembly parts are between element 111 and 60).

However, Wu does not disclose the means for securing the split sleeve against rotation wherein, the means for securing comprising a protuberance engaging said longitudinal slit of the split sleeve.

Kakii in Fig. 3, a protuberance is engaging in the longitudinal slit of the sleeve for the purpose of preventing the split sleeve from rotating. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to recognize the disclosure by Kakii would be easily modifiable with the art of Wu since the two arts both teach protuberance in the slit to restrict rotation, only Wu's sleeve is not entire split down the longitudinal axis. **The motivation** would have been to provide a rotational restriction to a split sleeve since tight fit of the split sleeve may loosen over long period of time and cause undesirable rotational play within the sleeve mount.

Regarding claims 28 and 38, examiner considers the depressed circular area of element 111 disclosed by Wu as a flange, and the circular opening of element 60 as a flange, which the two flanges abut each other when assembled with the securing plate (70) retained in a rotationally secure manner directly between the flanges and engaging the longitudinal slit of the sleeve by way of a protuberance.

Regarding claims 29 and 39, Wu discloses the flanges contain depression (see the smaller inner circle on element 111) for accommodating the securing plate (70) and the depressions each have a peripheral contour adapted to a peripheral contour of the securing plate.

Regarding claims 30 and 40, Wu discloses the securing plate (70) has a central opening, the sleeve is plugged through the central opening, and the protuberance is arranged on an inner periphery of the opening.

Regarding claims 31 and 41, Wu discloses the protuberance engages in the longitudinal slit of the sleeve without projecting into the interior of the sleeve (Fig. 8).

Regarding claims 32 and 42, Wu discloses the sleeve mount comprises means for defining the angle-of-rotation provided on the securing plate and the mount parts (Fig. 8 [70]).

Regarding claims 34 and 43, Wu discloses the peripheral contour allows radial play (70).

Regarding claims 35 and 44, Wu discloses the means for defining the angle-of-rotation orientation are bevels (Fig. 8 [72]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument with respect to claims 17 and 36 is not persuasive since Zimmer continues to disclose engaging the split sleeve to restrict rotational play. However, arguments made with respect to claims 28-32, 34-35, and 38-44 are persuasive, therefore new ground(s) of rejection in view of Wu and Kakii is provided.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erin D. Chiem whose telephone number is (571) 272-3102. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G. Font can be reached on (571) 272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Erin D Chiem/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2883

/Frank G. Font/
Supervisory Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2883

April 14, 2008
FGF/edc